

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 130 555

HE 008 293

AUTHOR Jobe, E. R., Ed.
TITLE Five Discussions on Postsecondary Education.
INSTITUTION Mississippi State Postsecondary Education Planning Board, Jackson.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Div. of Higher Education Research.
PUB DATE Jul 75
NOTE 48p.
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Athletics; Bibliographies; Educational Improvement; *Educational Planning; Equal Education; *Governance; Governing Boards; Open Education; *Planning; *Post Secondary Education; Statewide Planning; *Student Financial Aid
IDENTIFIERS 1202 Commissions; *Mississippi

ABSTRACT

Topics discussed are: (1) student aid and access to postsecondary education (Jack L. Woodward); (2) values in athletics (Grant Dungee); (3) some considerations in planning for postsecondary education (Paul G. Orr); (4) the open university as a challenge for postsecondary education in Mississippi (Cleopatra D. Thompson); and (5) comprehensive statewide planning for accessibility with effectiveness and efficiency as a dilemma for 1202 Commissions (S.V. Martorana). A bibliography is included. (Author/KE)

* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

FIVE DISCUSSIONS ON POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION 1975

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.



**MISSISSIPPI
POSTSECONDARY
EDUCATION
PLANNING
BOARD**

FIVE DISCUSSIONS ON
POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

Published by the

MISSISSIPPI POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION PLANNING BOARD

with funds from a grant made to the Board by the
U. S. Office of Education
as provided by the Higher Education Act of 1965 as amended

Dr. E. R. Jobe, Chairman

Dr. Milton Baxter, Executive Director

Jackson, Mississippi

July, 1975

POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION PLANNING BOARD

Mr. Manus Bartlett
Guntown

Dr. Milton Baxter
Jackson

Dr. Ernest A. Boykins
Itta Bena

Mr. James G. Chastain
Jackson

Mr. Travis Cliett
Jackson

Mr. Richard Cowart
Hattiesburg

Mr. Joe Ellis
Gulfport

Representative Bill R. Gibson
Bruce

Dr. Arthur Guyton
Jackson

Dr. J. T. Hall
Moorhead

Dr. Joe Holloway
Long Beach

Dr. E. R. Jobe
Jackson

Dr. Aubrey Lucas
Hattiesburg

Dr. Lewis Nobles
Clinton

Mr. Talmadge Portis
Clinton

Mrs. Robert Powers
Greenwood

Mrs. Joyce Smith
Poplarville

Senator Theodore Smith
Corinth

Mr. Charles Spencer
Fulton

Mr. Mike P. Sturdivant
Glendora

Dr. Felix Sutphin
Mathiston

Dr. Cleopatra Thompson
Jackson

Mr. W. L. Tobias
McComb

Mr. Thomas Waldrup
Ellisville

Mr. Harold T. White
Booneville

Mr. Milton White
Jackson

Mr. D. W. Wilburn
Yazoo City

Mr. Jim Yonge
Starkville

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Student Aid - A Key Access to Postsecondary Education	1
II. Values in Athletics	11
III. Some Considerations: Planning for Postsecondary Education	15
IV. The Open University: A Challenge for Postsecondary Education in Mississippi	21
V. Comprehensive Statewide Planning for Accessibility with Effectiveness and Efficiency	27
VI. Bibliography	38
VII. About the Authors	43

STUDENT AID - A KEY ACCESS TO POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION *

by Jack L. Woodward

The Right of the Individual to be Educated

Many historians feel that democracy was never practiced by the general public in the United States until after the Civil War. Since then, more and more segments of this country have begun to seek the rights assured them by the Bill of Rights and the Constitution. Though slower coming than some of the other rights, the right of all to be educated has begun to reach its apex. Reaching this point has not been easy, nor have the methods of arrival always been the best. In reality we cannot say that the apex has been reached. There are indications that the state of affairs for this right may be just that - a state of affairs.

The establishment of a correlation between the development of our postsecondary educational system and student financial aid is most important. At this stage in our educational history, the term postsecondary education and student aid are one and the same. Without some form of direct or indirect student aid none of our postsecondary institutions could exist. Therefore, the purpose of financial aid is to assure that both student and institution can carry out their proper function - education.

Early in its commitment to higher education through the National Defense Education Act of 1958, the federal government committed itself to the task of educating students "of ability" and seeing to it none would "be denied an opportunity for higher education because of financial need." Today this concept has been expanded by the 1975 National Task Force on Student Aid Problems as they state the following: "The primary purpose of student financial aid is to provide financial resources to students who would otherwise be unable to begin and complete the type of postsecondary education they wish to pursue. Student aid programs should be structured in such a way as to provide a coordinated system to achieve this purpose."

One Hundred - Plus Years of Higher Educational Growth

Following the Civil War, higher education began to expand both physically and economically. In the academic year 1869-70, there were 563 institutions of higher education with 5,553 faculty members and an enrollment of 52,286 students. One hundred years later, in the academic year 1969-70, there were 2,528 institutions, 825,000 faculty members, and an enrollment of 7,136,075. More dramatic is the growth in the ten-year period from 1959-60 to 1969-70. there was an increase of 520 institutions, 445,000 faculty and 3,921,000 students. Educational income jumped from \$4,668,352,000 to \$16,486,177,000 and educational expenditures rose from \$4,513,208,000 to \$15,788,699,000.

During the 1960's, higher education experienced its greatest growth. Reasons for this growth were: more financial aid was available, the "war babies" had arrived in the college arena, minority enrollment jumped higher than ever, many felt college was required before they could obtain any type of success, and a wide variety of

* This paper was prepared following several discussions on student aid before the Postsecondary Education Planning Board in the fall of 1974.

other reasons. Whatever the reason, more and more institutions were created and those already established increased their departments and schools to take care of this influx of students. This period can be called the golden era of growth for higher education.

The Development of Student Aid

The growth of higher education could not have taken place if there had not been a corresponding growth of student financial aid. Before the Civil War, there had not been a great expansion of higher education, since higher education was for a select and limited few. Hence, the amount and type of financial aid was limited and provided almost exclusively by the institution itself. However, in 1862, the land grant colleges were established by the Morrill Act of 1862. For the first time, certain vocations were elevated to a professional level, and thus studies for these professions were offered in these new institutions of higher education. These new low-cost colleges were supported by the states and local government. This concept was to be a major force in the development of our modern system of higher education and of its support through the indirect method of student aid - low cost tuition. Most direct student aid until the 1930's was provided by the institution and private foundations. The states did very little in this area; however, some did offer free tuition to Civil War veterans. The federal government's only action of direct aid prior to the 1930's was the establishment of the Reserve Officers Training Corp in 1922.

"Three major events occurred from 1930 to 1958 which had a tremendous impact on the movement of the federal government into the area of student financial aid: the depression of the 1930's, the Second World War, and the entry of Russia into outer space ahead of the United States." This statement is made by Joe L. McCormick, Director of Student Financial Aid at Mississippi State University, in his article entitled "The Role of the Federal Government in Student Financial Aid."

In the depression year 1933, the federal government created work opportunities on college campuses for students. In 1936, the National Youth Administration Work Program expanded the earlier programs. Following the Second World War, the first major veteran's programs (G.I. Bill) were developed. These programs of loans and grants were to help absorb the veterans into the main stream of American life without destroying the economy. The second veterans' bill came following the Korean conflict. Through these veterans' programs, an open concept of higher education began and was to help pave the way for the Golden Era of the Sixties. However, in October of 1957, higher education in America and, most certainly, direct student aid received support from an unexpected source - Russia launched the "Sputnik," the first satellite to reach outer space. The United States was now number two, a place not to the liking of anyone in America. In the spirit and tradition of the American people, we threw our all into the struggle to regain the number one spot. This action resulted in the beginning of the first major involvement of the federal government in direct aid to students. In 1958, the National Defense Education Act was passed by Congress, thus establishing the National Direct Student Loan Program (Title II) and the National Defense Fellowships.

Close on the heels of the NDEA Act of 1958 came the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 which provided assistance to universities and colleges through grants and loans for construction of academic facilities. With renewed efforts put forth to assist those students with real poverty situations, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 established the first College Work-Study Program of the sixties and was to provide direct aid to students.

By 1965, the middle of the Golden Era had been reached and the pressure had built for some far-reaching direct aid from the federal government to assist students and institutions of higher education. After considerable discussion and debate, the Congress passed the Higher Education Act of 1965. Under Title IV of this Act, the following programs were established or expanded: The Educational Opportunity Grant Program; The Guaranteed Student Loan Program; The College Work-Study Program; The Cooperative Education Programs; The Amendments to the National Defense Education Act; The Student Loan Provision.

The Higher Education Act of 1965 was to expire in 1968, and this brought about The Higher Education Amendments of 1968 which were to extend the programs of the Act of 1965. Few changes were added; however, a 3% administrative expense was added to the College Work-Study Program and the Educational Opportunity Grant Program. Also, this Act consolidated the maintenance of level effort for the Educational Opportunity Grant and the Work-Study Program. This simply meant that the institution participating in either or both of these programs was to continue to spend its own scholarship and student aid program funds at the same level of the average expenditure for the past three fiscal years preceding the effective date of this Act. The purpose of this was to ensure that institutions would not substitute federal funds for the now existing institutional funds.

The Present Situation of Student Aid

The Golden Era of the sixties like so many other "booms" had to reach a climax and then level off before some form of descent occurred. That leveling off was reached in the early 1970's, and the descent began almost as soon as the leveling off occurred. The first to feel a significant decline in enrollment were the private institutions of higher education. They already had higher tuition charges than the public institutions, but with inflation, they were forced to go even higher forcing a good portion of this student market to seek a lower cost educational institution. Not only were these institutions hurt by higher tuition, but many other sources of their support began to shrink because of the general economic conditions. By 1974 almost seventy-five private institutions had closed, merged, or "gone public", and some two hundred had exhausted their liquid assets.

During the 1960's, many states had begun establishing some form of assistance to private institutions, and their efforts have been expanded in the last few years. In 1974, forty-one states offered some form of assistance to all their students, whether in private or public institutions. This has been a contributing factor to the ability of many private institutions to stay alive and viable. This type of aid has created a situation whereby the student has a "free-choice" of the institution and program he desires and can afford. Dr. Lyman A. Glenny, Associate Director of Research and Development of Higher Education, the University of California in Berkley, says "the freer a student is to choose the more likely he is to pursue his real program interest."

With this assistance and its expansion to all states, private colleges and universities have a chance to survive and to continue as an important part of the educational community. Without it, their future is dark indeed.

The next to feel the impact of the student enrollment decline was the public four-year institutions. They also felt the crunch of the economy as their student market grew smaller in favor of the two-year community colleges. The end to the military draft had its impact, since there was a segment of students who sought refuge from the draft in the low-cost public institutions. Another factor was the students' "disillusionment with the 'job pay off' of a liberal arts education." Many others also say that the competition from the private sector was getting stiffer now that many states were providing state assistance to students attending private institutions. Whatever the reasons, the fact remains that the enrollment decrease was making inroads into the public sector. Public institutions not only lose the tuition funds because of student losses, but are hurt even greater because subsidies are most always based on enrollment formulae.

The last to feel the leveling off, if not an actual decline, was the community college. They also are caught in the shrinking student market and like all other postsecondary educational institutions, they are seeking ways to compete. Dr. Edmund J. Gleaser, Jr., President of the American Association of Junior and Community Colleges, states "community colleges now exist in a far more competitive environment than that of the sixties. Development education, occupational education, and other services considered by the community college to be among their distinctive offerings are found to be in a growing number of institutions that have a new awareness of the educational market." Like the four-year institutions, these institutions must be able to compete for the ever dwindling student market or create a new market.

Again, the pressure began to build on the Congress and the Administration to increase its funding of existing programs and to develop new programs to off-set the rising cost of higher education. The result of this pressure was the Educational Amendments of 1972. Again, we hear the familiar ring in the stated purpose of Title IV, Part A, Section 401. (a) "It is the purpose of this program, to assist in making available the benefits of postsecondary education to qualified students in institutions of higher education - - -." The ring is familiar but there is a vast difference in this legislation and the Educational Act of 1965. The scope and meaning of the term the institution of higher education have changed. The proprietary institutions are included in all the student aid programs of this act. No longer are we concerned with some 2,900 non-profit degree granting institutions of higher learning; but we add to this 7,000 profit making non-collegiate institutions. The Honorable John Dellenback, U. S. Representative and ranking minority member of the House Special Sub-Committee on Education says, "It can be seen the further out one goes from the traditional colleges and universities the more difficult it becomes for the federal government to define 'eligible institutions' and 'eligible students'." Hence, the more difficult it is to define these terms, the more inclusive the federal assistance becomes.

The Educational Amendment of 1972 also established a new concept of student aid entitlement. For the first time, the federal government says a student is entitled

to a grant of "\$1,400 less an amount equal to the amount determined under paragraph (3) to be the expected family contribution with respect to that student for that year." This grant "shall not exceed fifty percentum of the actual cost of attendance at the institution." This grant is to be the basis for all financial aid a student is to receive; therefore, the name of the grant is the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant.

The Educational Opportunity Grant Program became the Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant Program and was now open to more students than it had ever been before because of the changing in the meaning of the term "exceptional financial need." The term now became more inclusive and not as narrow as in the Higher Education Act of 1965. The Work-Study Program also became more inclusive when the need criteria was changed to read "from low income families" to students "with great financial need." Another change allowed for the transferring of ten percent of the federal capital contribution from either program to the other program. The SEOG and the CWS programs now became available to half-time students. The National Defense Student Loan Program became the National Direct Student Loan Program keeping many of the same terms of its predecessor. The major change came in the policies of cancellation. Cancellations are now harder to receive under this new program.

Several new programs were established besides the basic grant. The State Student Incentive Grant Program is to be a joint effort on the part of the State and the Federal Government in providing additional grant funds for students. Both the State and the Federal Government each will put up 50% of the funds for this program. The SSI Grants are to go to undergraduate students "of substantial financial need." These funds are to be "administred by a single State Agency." The important part here is that the State shall administer this program. This program is a real effort by the Federal Government to bring states more and more into the program of direct aid to students.

A most important section of this Act is Section (439): "Student Loan Marketing Association" or better known as "SALLIE MAE." This section establishes "a government-sponsored private cooperation which will be financed by private capital and which will serve as a secondary market and warehousing facility for insured student loans." This part of the Act may turn out to be one of the most important parts of these amendments. Many reluctant lenders of the Federally Insured Loan Program may find new life and extend their participation. This would extend funds to many students who can not now receive these funds.

One more section deserved to be mentioned briefly. It is a new federal concept of financing higher education; however, it has not been funded to date. The concept is "Assistance to Institutions of Higher Education". This is Title X of the amendments. Nothing has ever come of this concept except discussion. At this time, hearings are being held by Chairman James G. O'Hara of the House Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education on his bill (HR 3470) which would extend the almost expired programs passed in 1972 with little or no change. This bill also contains the concept of Title X and efforts to expand this concept are being discussed. Please do not confuse this bill with Mr. O'Hara's bill (HR 3471) which calls for drastic changes. The concept of HR 3471 will be discussed with several other proposed methods of financing aid to students.

Other Proposed Methods for Students

The first proposed method is by Dr. Irvin Kristol of New York University as expressed in his essay "Toward a Restructuring of the University." This may not be the best method, but it is a most sobering experience to read this essay. He feels that government aid to education should take the form of direct loans to students, giving them the "freedom to purchase the kind of education they want." He feels that the student is the prime beneficiary of his education; hence, he should pay for it. "There is no such thing as 'free' higher education. Someone is paying for it, and as things now stand, it is the working class of this country that is paying the taxes to send the sons and daughters of the middle-class - and of the wealthy, too - through state colleges." When the financial aid is loaned to the student, a sort of free market will come into play. "Colleges and courses of study relevant to students and their aspirations will thrive, while Micky Mouse programs will wither."

A basic truth is pointed out in this essay: "There is no such thing as 'free' higher education." No matter how we try to get around it, someone or 'someones' have to pay for the education of every student. The question is who should pay?

The Kristol method is one extreme and, hopefully, there are areas more near to the middle ground than his rather radical "credit card" suggestion. If higher education costs are to continue to rise, and at this point nothing shows a decline, the debt a student would incur would take a lifetime to repay. In fact several methods of lifetime repayment have been suggested. Both Yale and Duke Universities worked seriously on such a plan in order to assist their students who had and would acquire heavy debts.

Since one extreme has been mentioned, let us take time to consider its opposite. This next method proposed that the different forms of government, federal, state, and local, pay all the cost of postsecondary education. Mr. Arthur S. Marmaduke, Director of the California State Scholarship and Loan Commission, points out that society pays for kindergarten through the twelfth grade and also for most graduate work toward a Ph.D. program. Why not pay for the undergraduate years? He also states, "There is a historical and current inconsistency in the way we have approached the question of paying for education and we should ask why we treat grades thirteen through sixteen differently." Our response must be brief. If the student couldn't afford total payment under the previous plan, neither can the various forms of government, namely the taxpayer, afford to pay for the total education of a child.

Another method many feel that should be considered would be a savings plan by the student and his family so that when the student is ready for his postsecondary education he will have the funds. This seems to be a fair concept, but is it practical? It might be practical if the various forms of government would give tax breaks for the funds saved (this is also a method within a method). You can't force people to save, and if they didn't you would have an uneducated society. Another point is who can save in our economy? What would happen to those who have no funds to save - the disadvantaged students? How much would have to be saved if you would like to? The parents of a one-year old would have to save \$1,115 a year to have enough to pay the project cost of education, \$33,696 at a public institution eighteen years from now. Since every parent cannot do this, we would be right back where we started - needing funds for postsecondary education.

A rather unique form of payment was tried by a community college in Vermont. At registration, students were advised that the college needed the money and they were targeting payment at \$30 a course; however, it was up to the individual to decide how much he could pay. Mr. Peter P. Smith, Director of the College, pointed out that they did cut out a lot of bureaucratic hassling even though they did not collect much money. They did collect more this year than last since last year they collected nothing. The question again is who pays?

In 1972, the National Association of Manufacturers put forth their idea of financing higher education. They wanted all institutions to charge an "honest tuition" which means charge exactly what it costs to educate the individual. This charge would be made before any form of assistance, direct or indirect, would be considered against the cost. Once the tuition cost was established, then the federal, state, or local governments and any other benefactors could provide direct aid to the student to pay this cost, if the student were unable to pay it. Here the need analysis system would play a tremendous part in determining which families could pay and which could not. They also pointed out that this would not require any new funds from government sources. It would assist those who could not afford to pay and would force those who could to pay.

Similar to this proposed method, however not quite as drastic, was the recommendation by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Their report suggested that there be a graduated increase in the tuition charges at public institutions. There was a very rapid reaction to this suggestion from the educational community. The National Council of Independent Colleges and Universities stated that private institutions would be aided by "a coordinated program of moderate increases in public tuition and tuition-offset grants to private institutions." The American Association of State Colleges and Universities and Land Grant Colleges declared that a "magic money machine" would be needed to carry out such a proposal. They also stated that they opposed this sort of proposal to "save" private institutions. However, they did state "direct institutional aid and student aid to private colleges is a far more equitable way to help these institutions."

In 1973, the National Task Force on Higher Education which was established to advise the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, reported that rather than raise tuition at public institutions other methods should be used. The Task Force Chief, Mr. Frank Newman of Stanford University, felt the best way to help higher education would be through aid directly to the student and allow the student to be the buyer of his education - again, competition to assure quality. He felt revision of the student aid program would help both public and private institutions.

Often hinted at, but never fully developed has been the voucher system. My understanding of this system would be that it is similar to the method presented earlier by Dr. Marmaduke. The student is given an educational voucher that will see him through all the education he wants and can use whenever he wants to use it. This is almost a utopian idea and the only major flaw would be who pays for it. This could even be worked out if you could get any major consideration given to its development by the higher education community. However, at this time it is only alluded to and never taken seriously.

The last method to be put forth is the one most likely to prevail - the continuation of the Higher Education Amendments of 1972 with some proper revisions. Added to this a greater expansion of state participation in direct aid to students by larger appropriations to the State Student Incentive Grant Program.

Representative James C. O'Hara introduced HR 3471 as a bill that would drastically change the Higher Education Amendments of 1972. Some of the changes would be good and some very poor. The Basic Educational Opportunity Grant Program would be changed by setting a maximum amount of \$600 instead of \$1,400. His reason for this is that more students from low income families would attend low tuition schools. The Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant Program would only be funded to a maximum of \$200,000,000 for a year. This would limit the grants and their control would be by the Commissioner of Education rather than the institution. The Work-Study Program would be expanded by 1977 to \$480,000,000 and the need requirement would be dropped. The SSIG Program would increase from \$20,000,000 to \$200,000,000 and the states could use the funds for either grants or work. Both loan programs would suffer. The NDSL Program would be phased out and the states would have to take over the guarantee of the loans through the Guaranteed Loan Program. The latter might be a good idea; however, how would this increase the number of lenders in the state? These are by no means all the provisions of the proposed bill but these statements do point out vast changes offered by this legislation.

Conclusion

With all said and done the financing of student aid comes down to this reality - who will pay and how? Education is also a fact of economics and if we are to educate our citizenry someone will have to pay. There is no such thing as a free education. One way or another someone pays the bill. There should be no question that both the parent and the student should have to pay whatever they can reasonably be expected to pay. This certainly means that we must continue to re-study and revise the need analysis system used to determine the expected parental and student contributions. But it is also certain that they should pay their part. Once you put something of your own into an undertaking, you are more committed to the best possible use of that endeavor.

It is just as certain that once we have determined the extent of the family contribution, we are going to find that we have not begun to touch the real expense of postsecondary education. This means that we must continue to expand the federal programs. In 1974, some \$2,612,000,000 was expended through the student aid programs established by the Educational Amendments of 1972. The Social Security Program spent some \$758,000,000 and the largest student aid program, Veterans' Benefits, accounted for \$1,590,000,000. Total these and you will see that the federal government spent \$4,960,000,000 on aid to students. States, institutions of higher education, and other private sources expended during the same period a total of \$1,239,300,000. Thus, some \$6,369,300,000 was spent on student aid in 1974. Still, this did not meet the need of all students nor did it pay the total cost of postsecondary education.

To make the point more dramatic and closer to home, let me give you a few facts about Mississippi and the students' need for aid. These figures are based on the fall enrollment of 1972. The survey was done by the Mississippi Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators, Joe L. McCormick, President. There were some 61,432 students in degree granting institutions alone and of these students, 29,115 applied for assistance. This means that 47.4% applied for assistance. Some \$38,728,000 would have been needed to give assistance to these students. The total federal aid amounted to \$13,524,000, thus leaving a need for further assistance of \$25,204,000. Let's break it down a different way. The average cost of all institutions in Mississippi that year was \$1,964 for an individual student. Of this cost the parent and student paid \$263.18. The institution paid \$170.87, and other contributions accounted for \$200.33. This left a need of \$1,329.62. The federal aid for this individual was \$459.58, leaving an unmet need of \$870.04. These figures tell us that even with all the aid provided by the federal programs, we still have a tremendous unmet need for those who apply for aid.

Do we dare try to increase funds from the federal government? Do we say to all parents and students you must sacrifice more? Do we lower the quality of our educational system so as to lower the cost? Do we say that only those who can afford to pay can get an education? We must try to expand the federal programs whenever possible; however, we must also bring Mississippi into a greater effort toward student aid even if it may cost institutions some of their weaker programs. The state must be encouraged to fund the State Student Incentive Grant Program. Also, we must press to see that the legislature funds the loan program passed during the 1975 Session. It would widen the availability of Federally Insured Loans to students. Also, it is important that some form of assistance to students at private institutions be considered and funded.

In summation, we as citizens, students, parents, legislators, educators and all others must come together to find methods of educating our citizenry so that our future as a people and a nation can be ensured.

PLANNING BOARD COMMENTS

The volume of student aid in the form of grants and loans from three sources (institutional, state, and federal) far exceeds the amounts available just a few years ago. Current plans of federal agencies and Congress appear to forecast increasing financial support to college students. Additionally, the number of federal programs providing funds for postsecondary study increases with almost every session of Congress. Student aid officers in the several institutions need assistance in determining need where recipients may be listed for more than one grant or loan for the same time period. In order to provide an agency qualified to represent all sectors of postsecondary educational training and to deal completely with all agencies operating in this area, it appears that the existing Guaranteed Loan Authority created by the 1974 Legislature should be given additional responsibilities and appropriations.

1. The name of the agency should be changed to Mississippi Postsecondary Student Aid Authority.
2. Additional sections of the law should be enacted to provide for the agency to deal with all state and federal agencies providing loans and grants to students.
3. A sufficient initial appropriation should be made to support a competent staff, not to exceed \$50,000.
4. An initial appropriation should be made for the purpose of matching federal funds available in the State Student Grant Program, approximately \$300,000.
5. An additional amount should be appropriated for state student loans for those not qualifying under federal need restrictions or otherwise

VALUES IN ATHLETICS *

by Dr. Grant Dungee

Intercollegiate athletics, when utilized properly, serve as potential educational media through which optimum growth - physical, mental, emotional, social, and moral - of the participants may be fostered. During the many arduous practice sessions and in the variety of situations that arise during the heat of the contests, the players must repeatedly react to their own capabilities and limitations and to the behavior of others. These repeated reactions, and the psychological experiences result in changes, mental, as well as physical, in the players. Because each contest is usually surrounded by an emotionally charged atmosphere and the players are vitally interested in the outcome of the game, the players are most pliable, and hence, more subject to changes that are educationally desirable, unless all phases of athletics are expertly organized and conducted.

Physical Fitness

The desire to excel in athletics is one of the strongest forces available for motivating the American boy to expend voluntarily the vigorous efforts required to develop a high degree of fitness. Because of his desire to excel in athletic competition, he will willingly and eagerly participate in strenuous conditioning, programs and practice sessions to develop the strength, endurance, and the skill requisite to excellent performance. He will submit to regular physical examinations by a physician, abide by rigid training rules, and adhere to recommended diets. Because his performance is evaluated regularly and decisively during each athletic contest, the relationship between his efforts and his success is readily apparent to him. Thus, he learns how physical fitness is achieved and maintained. At the same time, he experiences this feeling of unbounded physically fit competence, and he may form favorable and lasting attitudes toward exercise and toward physical fitness.

Skill Movement

To attain success in athletics, the participant must train his mind and body to respond instantly and effectively to the multitude of situations that arise during the course of play. The resultant development of skill in movement enables him to accomplish the everyday physical requirements of his work efficiently and with ease and to respond quickly and effectively in emergencies that demand usual strength, endurance, speed, or coordination.

Social Development

Authorities on child growth and development agree that participation in competitive play provides the child with invaluable opportunities for expending effort that leads to success or failure, for judicious risks and thrills that build up his morale and his capacity to endure and to "stand the gaff", and from which he gains in his early concepts of sportsmanship.

*Prepared for presentation to the Postsecondary Education Planning Board, Jackson, Mississippi, April 9, 1975.

The competitive world among children as well as adults is neither gentle nor overly kind. In such a world, however, the youngster under wise direction begins to grow toward social maturity by learning to (1) suffer his mild hurts, mental or physical, in silence (2) control his emotional outbursts, (3) disguise or hide his feeling of fear, (4) restrain the outward expression of sudden impulses, (5) understand and endure delays in getting what he wants, and (6) reject being "babied".

The intense and challenging situations in athletic competition provide the youth with socially acceptable channels through which he may express his aggressive tendencies and expend his excess energy. Opportunities in which he may control many of his antisocial tendencies through sublimation, and in which he may compensate for real or imagined inadequacies are abundant. In athletics, he can express his emotions vigorously in a socially acceptable manner.

The growing boy earnestly desires recognition and prestige. He lacks self-confidence and needs some means of gaining it. Athletics provide him an opportunity to take his place on a team and thereby gain group acceptance and group approval. Through success in athletics, his feelings of inferiority may be assuaged. By trying himself out in highly emotionally aroused experiences and deep-seated feelings, he may learn to perform acceptably, despite the intense emotional upheaval. Gradually, he may attain a mental poise and emotional stability that will serve him well in moments of stress.

In athletics, the boy may learn to work cooperatively as a member of a group that is striving for a common goal. He may learn to abide by the rules and to play fairly; not from fear of penalty, but because the success of his team and the enjoyment of all are thus enhanced. He may experience the humbling lessons of defeat and learn to read just his valued concepts. He may learn that he must discipline himself to meet his responsibilities and to achieve success in which he may share. He may learn the meaning and the value of group loyalty and group morale and may experience the emotional responses associated with the esprit de corps that is developed as the members of the team practice together, suffer and endure together, and win and lose together.

In athletics, the boy may learn to tolerate the weakness and shortcomings of others and to understand that all men have common desires and aspirations. Prejudices toward others tend to melt away during the grueling practices toward the "trial by ordeal" of the games. He may learn to judge his teammates by their behavior and their contributions to the success of the team and to disregard economic, racial, or religious differences.

Recreation

Athletics can provide the youth and the adult with abundant opportunities for utilizing their leisure in activities that are both healthful and wholesome. The highly mechanized nature of American society and the consequent degeneration in the physical fitness of citizens and youth make mandatory an increased emphasis on the utilization of athletics as a means of recreation.

Athletic games and contests are ideally suited to the leisure needs of youth. The normal boy is bursting with energy. He restlessly searches for excitement, adventure, and a cause for which to strive. Unless proper opportunities and proper direction are provided, he may find undesirable outlets for his boundless energy and his turbulent urges. Athletics sponsored by schools, churches, clubs, industries, communities, and national organizations offer him recreational pursuits that fulfill his immediate needs and provide a means through which he may develop qualities essential to living a useful and successful life.

Dual and individual sports, together with the team games that do not demand of participants high levels of physical fitness and skill, offer the adult opportunities for healthful exercise and a release from the tensions and the worries that beset him as he struggles with the problems of living in a complex world. As spectators, both the youth and the adult can share vicariously in the spirit of the struggle, the despair of defeat, and the joy of victory experienced by teams and individual athletes performing in public contests. Such contests between professionals as well as between amateurs are common to the cultures of all modern nations and serve as a basis for worldwide communication and understanding between peoples of all nationalities and races.

Problems in Athletics

1. Recruitment and Proselyting
2. Scouting
3. Overemphasis
4. Community Pressure
5. Finances and Gate Receipts
6. Qualified Coaches
7. Coaches' Salaries
8. Spectator Control
9. Eligibility
10. Scholarship
11. Tournaments and Championships

Athletics for Women

1. Same Values and Problems
2. Masculine Stigma Erased

Some Personal Observations

1. A way out of the ghetto
2. A chance for college
3. Break down racial barriers
4. National and international travel
5. Gives institutional visibility
6. Promotes school pride and spirit
7. Attracts students
8. Gain recognition

PLANNING BOARD COMMENTS

The Postsecondary Education Planning Board supports the policy of including a comprehensive program of intercollegiate athletics for competitive sports including representative teams of men and/or women into the total educational program of the universities and colleges. The Board believes that intercollegiate athletics provide benefits of educational and cultural value not only to students and other individuals but to institutions, communities, and to the state as well. Such values and experiences cannot be provided in other phases of the educational program and warrant full acceptance of intercollegiate athletics for institutional and financial support from the general budgets of the institutions and from the state.

It is further recommended that the Legislature and the institutions continue to provide and maintain facilities and equipment for athletics for men and to expand provisions to meet needs for women's sports as developed in several institutions.

Additionally, it is recommended that the Legislature provide as an expansion of existing scholarship programs supported by special appropriations or by budget authorization an additional sum for the use of all institutions in scholarships for athletics.

It is recommended that scholarships for athletics be administered by the State Student Loan Authority.

SOME CONSIDERATIONS:

PLANNING FOR POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION *

by Paul G. Orr

I am delighted to have this opportunity to meet with the Mississippi Postsecondary Education Planning Board. My remarks today will focus on teacher education both as a part of higher education and as one part of a system of relationships that is responsible for preservice and continuing preparation of personnel for schools.

I cannot treat this complex topic comprehensively during 30 minutes, but I will highlight for you what I believe to be the major considerations. The weakness in this approach is that I will leave some gaps and will tend to resort to oversimplifications.

Dr. Jobe, the Planning Board Chairman, also asked me to share with you some of the findings of the Dean's Committee of the "Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers." Therefore, I will also use, quote and react to part of one of the Commission's reports, The Future: Create or Inherit. I give full credit to Paul Olson, the Commission Chairman, and to others for using freely what they have written, but I do not hold them responsible for what I say today or for my interpretations of what the Study Commission has published. I disagree with some major points in the Commission's reports and agree with other parts.

The Study Commission published several books, booklets, and reports. The content was informative, helpful and, I believe, productive. It was laced with the painfully naive, the patently bizarre and the euphoria produced by oversimplification of complex problems. It is also a comprehensive treatment of the shortcomings and the nature of education, teacher education and society in general. It is full of suggestions, new ideas and possible solutions for the future. In fact, it brought home to me the full meaning of one of our popular Southern sayings, "it's better not to know so much than to know so much that's not so." I do recommend, however, that the various reports be read, studied and considered by anyone responsible for teacher education.

First of all, I want to share with you five major circumstances in our society and our schools which I believe to be accurate:

1. Schools - largely reflecting society - are changing rapidly and current programs for the training and preparation of personnel for schools need major changes. Those responsible for planning and policy need to create new conditions and better conditions for schooling.
2. Education is decreasing as a function of schooling and increasing as a function of many conditions that result in learning: the ambience of communities, crime, radio, TV, travel, movies, newspapers, books,

* Prepared for presentation to the Mississippi Postsecondary Education Planning Board, Jackson, Mississippi, June 11, 1975

etc. Policy makers and others must build new bridges between schooling and education and view learning in a much broader context than in the past.

3. Pluralism is a reality in culture, information, language, values, etc. and most schools no longer can practice selectivity in shaping beliefs and providing information.

4. Teachers and other school personnel are going to have to be trained at a much higher level and with much greater selectivity if they are to be competent to meet the demands of our increasingly complex society. Also, all policies and conditions of education and learning at all levels will involve increasingly the influence of teachers, parents, students, and communities. The major need for the next several years is to assure that new teachers are of high quality and that in-service teachers get the kind of assistance that they need (with their involvement in determining what they need).

5. The main challenge of a diverse and pluralistic society is to assure that we do not lose the knowledge and wisdom of what we have in common and fail to transmit it. I do not refer to the "melting pot" theory - which is largely a myth - but to our increasing interdependence nationally and internationally. I am apprehensive that movements toward cultural, racial or other isolation preclude opportunities for learning about the relation of each person to the furtherance of democracy, freedom, liberty, and indeed civilization. Have those who would cripple our form of government seriously studied history and related this knowledge to individual behavior and responsibility? Do all of our teachers understand the wisdom of Churchill's reference to democracy as the worst form of government except every other kind? Has some modicum of wisdom resulted from study in social and behavioral sciences and in the humanities? More than ever before, in my opinion, we have a dire need for high quality general education. This general education and education in a teaching field is not professional education - it is the essence of higher education and primarily the responsibility of colleges of arts and sciences. There should be no question in anyone's mind that teacher education is a function of a university as a whole. My point in all of this as it relates to teacher education is that schools will continue to be the major societal vehicle for the common education of children and youth. I cannot accept the proposition that all of us don't have much in common - the common good is a stronger reason for common education than is any separatist approach to education and learning. Obviously, teachers of the present and of the future need a high quality of assistance and training if they are to be effective. The educational solution to the future is to make each school the best possible school and the most vital element in a good school is well qualified personnel with continuing assistance and training.

These general circumstances may not appear to be too controversial; however, I assure you that they are. For example: (1) most teacher preparation programs are

not changing substantially, (2) the vast majority of schools continue to function from an information giving type of curriculum and mode of instruction, (3) most preparation programs and schools largely ignore the conditions of pluralism, (4) very few people believe that teachers as a group have improved dramatically in effectiveness and competency (some believe we are not as well off as we were in the past), and (5) general education has been seriously eroded as supporting disciplines have become more isolated and less interested in non-majors.

The most dramatic fact that surfaces in discussions related to teacher education is the oversupply of teachers. Some view this as a major problem. During the next decade, a conservative estimate of the surplus is 400,000; a top estimate is 2,000,000. Rather than viewing this surplus as a problem, I view it as an opportunity for any state to plan and to implement a high quality teacher education program. To be more explicit, my professional opinion is that at least half of the current teacher education programs in Alabama should be abolished forthwith and about one half of the remaining programs should be more limited in scope than they are now. I would add that I doubt that conditions are much different in Mississippi, or in most other states.

I am aware fully (and painfully I might add) that this is easier said than done. For the purpose of illustration, let's assume that we could agree that higher quality programs are needed for fewer teacher education personnel in the state and that higher quality and more intensive in-service and continuing educational opportunities are needed by all currently employed school personnel. Operating from this assumption, let's examine the reasons which preclude translating the previous statement of supposed agreement into action:

1. There is a growing opinion that University level teacher education should be available to any and all population clusters; most believe it should be convenient to all, others believe it is politically expedient to make education convenient irrespective of quality, and others are interested in the economic impact of an institution on the community.
2. Former normal schools and teacher colleges which have become in many cases universities (in name) have changed basically by expanding their programs to the graduate level; they now have a clientele and in many cases a political base and are budgeted on a formula which encourages graduate work and expanded undergraduate enrollment. They want to be complete, not restricted.
3. Many advocate the abolishment or replacement of all colleges of education rather than a change in their function and scope. Abolishment seems to be more drastic than the human element can tolerate; nevertheless, dramatic changes which are needed are lost by the frightening nature of the revolutionary alternatives which are proposed, e.g., optional schools, schools segregated by race-pupils and teachers, no teachers, no standards, street schools, no schools curricula determined only by students, voucher schools, etc.

4. In spite of the rapidity of change in society, change in society's institutions and schools is developed by providing opportunity for people to change, learn and develop. Many good and productive thrusts are lost because of lack of instant success.

5. The "educational establishment", as we are called, is basically cautious and somewhat conservative - this includes state boards and commissions, local school boards, university and college trustees and, with some notable exceptions, most public university and college administrators. These groups generally are not quite bold enough.

6. The certification of teachers by approval and/or accreditation processes of teacher education programs is increasingly unrelated to the quality of the program or the competency of the graduate. In many cases it is a mockery; however, we rely very heavily on these processes even though they tend not to work.

Thus far, I have cited a few examples of circumstances; I have suggested to you that we now have an opportunity unfettered by high demand for quantity and I have listed a few of the major constraints related to teacher education and the schooling and the education of children and youth.

First, we have been successful in increasing holding power of schools. We have more children and youth in school for a longer period of time. We also have a dearth of responsive programs for many students and many more cases of lower achievement generally and unsatisfactory adjustment at an increasing rate. A school and its community must become related and the form will vary considerably. For schools to improve, they need more assistance than they now have and they need to have a steady supply of highly qualified personnel. They have little assurance of either now. Obviously, I am suggesting to you that good, responsive schools must be placed at a local community level. Certain conditions and criteria, however, must be functions of the state.

Secondly, a massive proliferation of teacher education programs has developed at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Resources have been dissipated to the point that quality is seriously eroded in even the best institutions. The net result has been an increased number of underprepared and ill-qualified educational personnel.

Thirdly, practically all school personnel can identify areas in which they need assistance for on-going or new programs and they are not able to find and get assistance. There is no lack of work that needs to be done; there is a massive amount of miss-directed priorities in the work that higher education performs, for example, training more teachers than are needed rather than upgrading the capability of in-service teachers who can no longer cope with their job. Let me give you a concrete example - thousands of children who can learn to read do not learn how to read because resources and competencies needed to teach them are not available. Lacking this ability, however, children are not only condemned to a lack of personal realization but also become unmanageable as they proceed in school and frustrated as they proceed in life. Should not the treatment of this need be a top priority?

Fourthly, the level of training is increasingly an unreliable measure of competency. I may be guilty of some overstatement, but it appears to me that the vast majority of teacher education programs have started an evolutionary march toward offering the doctorate. Those with bachelor's level programs are planning for the masters degree; those with master's are planning for the sixth year program and perhaps the doctorate, and all appear to believe that they have good reasons for doing so. At this point in time, any holder of a bachelor's degree, with the price of tuition and the patience to sit through 20 credit courses, can be admitted to some institution and be recommended for a sixth year certificate and be issued one. The range of differences between and among certificate holders at all levels is increasing at a rapid rate. Perhaps I should be more explicit and state that in my opinion, massive erosion of standards for teacher education programs is occurring as quantity overpowers quality in formula budget races, particularly since 40% of the enrollment in higher education is in teacher education - I regret to report to you that I am convinced that many teacher education graduates of some institutions would rank in the bottom quarter of a typical high school senior class in a moderately good high school.

What I have stated to you is harsh. It omits many of the good, beneficial and high quality teacher education programs which indeed respond to new and different needs. My purpose today, however, has been to focus on circumstances, conditions, constraints and results of these and to suggest to you one major conclusion: All states should have a comprehensive state plan for teacher education. Implicit in this report is the opinion that such a plan cannot be developed by higher education alone but indeed must be developed in consort with those responsible for finance and certification of public education and public education personnel. By creating certain conditions through planning and action, teacher education programs in higher education can then join with personnel in local schools and invent plans for improvement and development through in-service assistance. Graduate level programs can become high quality and can be relied upon to produce quality graduates.

I would suggest to you further that the hardest decision confronting you will be to treat the following elements, which in my opinion, are vital:

1. Foster staff development plans in all schools as a part of their own comprehensive development plans and assure reasonable resources for their implementation.
2. Assess carefully all teacher education programs, undergraduate and graduate, and abolish the unpromising ones and reallocate resources to priority needs.
3. Identify and foster a few high quality graduate teacher education programs and encourage teacher education as a university commitment and function (not limited to a college, school, or department of education).
4. Take steps to assure agreement that certification of teacher education graduates at all levels and in all fields is closely related to quality. Limiting programs initially is more likely to succeed than is any attempt to limit issuance of certificates after program completion.

I recognize fully that I have omitted many important aspects of this complex problem I have tried to treat in a limited time. I hope some of the ideas and opinions are valuable to you.

I will close by saying that I am optimistic about teacher education and higher education because I do believe that it will be reformed and that indeed we will create a future that is much better than we would inherit if we simply left major decisions to chance. I credit our educational institutions and our schools with having created that critical mass of people needed in order to assure that all people will have the benefit of a responsive education.

PLANNING BOARD COMMENTS

The Planning Board considers the problem of over production of college and university graduates with exclusive training in specialized fields of teacher education to be of such magnitude as to require carefully constructed modifications in schools of education curricula and practices. Over 40% of recipients of degrees from Mississippi institutions in 1974 were in the area of teacher education and administration. Obviously, new patterns of institutional selectivity, counseling and career information by degree granting institutions are required.

Increased attention to inservice development of school system personnel not geared to college credit hours is needed from schools of education.

The expansion of vocational-technical programs and the increased enrollment in these schools which demand many additional technically trained instructors indicates the necessity to develop new and adequate curricula for the training of instructors in this essential field of education.

Finally, the Board encourages the schools of education to continue their efforts toward reorienting curricula generally toward broader based learning, which provides values and experiences useful for other professions than teaching.

THE OPEN UNIVERSITY: A CHALLENGE FOR POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION IN MISSISSIPPI

By Cleopatra D. Thompson, Ed.D. *

One of the most important experiments in postsecondary education is the establishment of the "open university," as it is generally known in Great Britain. The parallel of this concept in the United States is the "university without walls." During the mid 60's, higher education came under attack. The climate was ripe for major reforms in higher education. A central feature of the revolution in education is the growing trend from mass teaching toward individualized learning, and from educating the professionally oriented to educating a cross section of the population. It has been long recognized that most systems of higher education in European countries rest on the elitist concept. In 1900, only 0.8 per cent of the relevant age group in Britain entered a university. By 1962, this figure had risen to only 4 per cent plus another 2.5 per cent in teacher training. It was in 1963 that a government sponsored committee under the chairmanship of Lord Robbins issued a voluminous report on the state of higher education in Britain. In practical terms, the Robbins' report recommended the doubling of available places within a decade. The report was an indictment of the past, and stated "if it is true that a higher proportion of the relevant age group is now capable of benefitting from higher education, it follows that many adults must have been deprived of a university education for no reason other than insufficient places." In numerical terms, it was estimated that more than an additional million people would have been qualified for higher education had the Robbins' proposal been applied thirty years earlier - not an insignificant proportion of a population of only a little more than 50 million. It was to this forgotten million that planners of the open university directed their attention; it was they who prompted Lord Ritchie Calder to dub the open university, the "university of the second chance." Over 24,000 students began their studies in 1971.

In contrast to other universities in Britain where the distribution, according to age and other sociological attributes of the students, is uniform with a relative narrow range, the students of the open university are likely to come from a wide range of family, economic, and occupational groupings. Most open university students have no previous academic qualifications, and many do not have the experience of high school study. Under these circumstances, rapid monitoring of students' progress and remedial help at the critical moment can easily mean the difference between success and failure.

Mr. Harold Wilson, Leader of the Labor Party and Prime Minister, who was in power in 1967, conceived of a university which would be founded on three basic principles:

* This paper was presented to the 1202 Commission on Postsecondary Education, during the monthly meeting on July 12, 1975. Dr. Cleopatra D. Thompson, a member of the Commission, is Dean of the School of Education at Jackson State University, Jackson, MS.

1. It would draw its students from those who had missed out on the conventional system of education.
2. It should provide them with some kind of inservice training; they would retain their normal work while pursuing university studies in their spare time.
3. It should use the modern media, and television especially for communicating with students in the most effective ways possible. Thus, the originality of the open university consisted of three things:
 - a. Openness to students
 - b. Openness in curricula
 - c. Openness in methods of presentation

Time will not permit a thorough description of these principles.

Students may be classified according to the type of student or to the type of graduate:

1. Those students who expect the acquisition of a degree to make a material difference to their career.
2. People to whom graduation from the open university will make no material difference in their lives. These include retired people, people near the end of their career, and people already in high brackets, all of whom will be taking courses simply for reasons of self improvement in a consumption or non-economic sense.
3. Non-graduating students, since lectures are being delivered in the home it is probably that facility of attendance will encourage large numbers of people to follow selected courses or parts of courses from time to time, without registering and having no intention of graduating.
4. Those of the non-graduating students who subsequently decided to enroll formally and finally graduate - "Dropins."

What emerged from the years of planning was the prototype of an integrated system of home-based, university standard education comprising written material programmed for self instruction; television and radio programs transmitted by BBC on Sunday morning and between 5:30 and 7:30 p.m. (Prime Time) on weekdays; student assignments, some of which are graded by computer and others by a national network of part-time tutors; a similar network of part-time tutors for face to face instruction; summer school within a traditional university setting for all students; and in science a \$300 practical kit for laboratory experiments in the home.

In 1972, the full-time central academic staff of about 200 was divided into six faculties (science, humanities, social science, mathematics, educational studies and technology) that work closely together on a small campus situated in the heart of Milton Keynes, a

new city about 50 miles north of London. The function of the central staff is to design both the individual courses, and the overall learning system; more specifically, write the student self instruction, assignment material, design, in conjunction with the BBC, the television and radio programs, and carry out a whole range of activities that are characteristic of university life anywhere. In addition, members of an associated institute of educational technology assist the faculty in developing educational techniques and monitoring the results. Professors are appointed largely by the usual university criteria of research and teaching.

On a wider scale, the country is divided into 12 regions, each of which has a small full-time academic and administrative staff whose functions are to organize the nationwide tutorial system and summer schools in accordance with academic criteria set by the central and regional academic staffs. Spread among the 12 regions are more than 250 local study centers (usually in universities, technical colleges or schools) at which students may receive counseling and face to face instruction, and if they have missed the broadcasts on the national network, view the T.V. programs on film and listen to the radio program on tape. The tutorial and counseling functions are handled by more than 3,000 counselors, part-time academicians of three types: (1) counselors who offer personal and operational advice on the learning system; (2) class tutors who lecture and conduct seminars; and (3) correspondence tutors who grade student assignments and offer academic advice in writing or by telephone. Summer schools on the other hand are compulsory and each student is required to attend for one week for each course he studies.

In 1971, students could select from four first-year "foundation" courses in science, humanities, social science, and mathematics. A fifth in technology was added later, each of which comprises 34 weeks work (34 units). The emphasis on each course is on interdisciplinary studies; thus, the science foundation course, for example, stresses the unity of science and emphasizes the social consequences and interactions of the various specialities; the humanities foundation course likewise combines history, music, literature, art, religion, and symbolic logic. Second level and third level courses are more specialized but still broadly based. No student will be allowed to pursue completely mono-disciplinary courses, however, since the degree requirements include at least two foundation courses.

Each week's study (each unit) normally requires 10 hours of work - six hours of self instruction, a half-hour of T.V., a half-hour of radio, a half-hour of self assessment test, another half-hour of subjective assessment to be graded later by tutors, about an hour of objective assignments to be graded by computer, and in science about an hour for home experiments.

T.V. programs are mostly documentaries - not the usual televised lectures. All written materials are presented on letterpress, and with the exception of assignments, are available for sale to the public. What this means in effect, is that the open university is also a vast academic publishing house and has the marketing organization to match.

Administrative and operational staff outnumber the faculty four to one, a situation that, certainly, has its potential dangers. The successful completion of a 34 unit course

entitles the students to one credit, six of which are required for a degree and eight of which are for an "honors" degree. A credit is awarded on the basis of performance on the tutor-graded and computer-graded assignments, the summer school, and a final examination. The open university is unique in Britain, not only in awarding credits, but also in adopting continuous assessment as opposed to the usual practice of judging a student by his performance in a single examination at the end of three years' work.

Those who have been involved in the British open university say they have had their moments of elation and moments of depression, their rewards and their disappointments. But the high success rate in credit acquisition leaves no doubt that the system works well. It is perhaps pertinent to note that student assignments, summer school work, and examinations were graded on a "criteria based" system, meaning that the grading was to an absolute scale and was not adjusted to obtain a predetermined pass rate. Moreover, a team of external assessors ensured, as far as possible, that standards were comparable to those in other universities within the British State System. The final pass rate of 92.5 per cent is thus a real measure of achievement.

During the same period that innovations in higher education were being studied and/or introduced in Great Britain, higher education in the United States was receiving new fermentation and added momentum through research, experimentations and through the use of electronic technology. Some examples from our own country include the following:

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching created a commission to examine and make recommendations regarding vital issues in higher education. Major concerns of higher education for study and investigation included: structure, function and governance; innovation and change; demand, resources, costs and expenditures; and efficiency in the use of resources. Special reports were issued from the study by McGraw-Hill Book Company.

The Carnegie Report on non-traditional study was prepared by a panel of 26 well-known educators, and was edited by Samuel B. Gould. The focus of these several essays is postsecondary education. The authors present a convincing case for college and university programs that will capitalize on the community resources, experiences and potentials of certain neglected groups who have so much to gain from college level work.

"The Sunrise Semester" sponsored by New York University at 6:30 a.m., features distinguished scholars on a variety of topics, such as The Tragic Drama of Greece and Rome; The Nature of Matter, Classical Mythology, and Social Anthropology of Africa. The programs, offered for credit and non-credit, may be viewed from coast to coast, and credit is offered by forty other colleges; meanwhile, the program has won four Emmy Awards.

In 1971, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools ratified Standard Nine which provided the opportunity for schools accredited by the Association to offer external degree programs.

An article was published in the November, 1973 issue of Phi Delta Kappan, entitled, "The External Doctorate Blessing or Blasphemy?" by Dr. R. B. Marland. Three external degree programs, located in Florida, are described in the report:

1. Nova University, Fort Lauderdale, Florida
2. Laurence University, Sarasota, Florida
3. Walden University, Naples, Florida

These functional programs have attracted national attention. Of the three, the writer states that the Nova program is the most comprehensive and best developed. Its degree requires three years above the master's degree to earn the doctoral degree as opposed to one year for each of the other two institutions. Nova is the only one accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Laurence and Walden Universities have temporary licenses to operate under Florida's Board of Independent Colleges and Universities. This Board has been responsible for closing seventeen institutions awarding Ph.D. and Ed.D. programs.

Two external degree programs are offered by Nova University for school administrators: (1) National Educational Program for Educational Leaders and (2) degree program for community college leaders. The former is centered in 27 clusters in 15 states and the latter is centered in 27 clusters in 13 states.

School administrators meet once a month in seminars to work on problems and to hear national lecturers. There are eight areas of competencies and the program consists of six core modules, each carrying nine semester hours to be completed the first two years. The final year is spent in different special modules and in writing the dissertation. From 1971-1973, Nova University had awarded 1,600 doctoral degrees, and it was estimated that more than 400 degrees would be completed by 1975.

Educational Testing Service reported that 1,000 to 1,400 non-traditional programs have been initiated by colleges and universities, and most of them were four years old or less.

According to Marland, the major purposes for writing his article "were to inform and raise basic questions. Among them: Will the persons who complete programs similar to those described possess the scholarship, knowledge, and skills expected of those holding the highest degrees in the profession?" At that time (1973) the external doctorate in education was less than three years old; yet, more than 500 Ed.D. and Ph.D. degrees had been conferred by two of the institutions, and another had enrolled 1500 students in doctoral programs in 58 centers scattered across the nation.

Donald P. Mitchell, Director of the National Ed.D. Program for Educational Leaders, Nova University, published a reply to Marland's article. He criticized Marland and the Phi Delta Kappan for publishing materials which questions Nova's external degrees.

The number of degrees offered has caused some concern in educational circles; nevertheless, it is generally believed that the basic idea of external degree programs is a noble one and should be encouraged. A college or university degree can be earned without attendance at a university and without becoming a fad. It is not one, however, that should be contaminated by fostering questionable practices under the name of innovation.

Several books and numerous articles have been published during the past decade depicting the innovative pioneering work to make higher education more relevant.

Implications and Challenges for Postsecondary Education in Mississippi

Educational aspirations are changing in directions that cannot be accommodated within the present system of colleges and universities. The impact of knowledge explosion, population explosion, modern technology, world hunger are major challenges of great significance.

The present restless era is giving rise to an educational aspiration of a new kind which is centered upon social experience, where both student and professors learn from each other, and from the community. In addition to being liberally educated, more efforts must be placed on preparing persons for career certification. There is the need for a global perspective and outlook. Universities must take advantage of learning resources beyond the campus; therefore, a variety of experiences must be provided in settings other than the classroom.

The open university in Britain, and the college without walls in the United States are experiments to watch, not only because of their boldness, but because of their broadening concept of what postsecondary education should include in order to be more relevant and more effective in meeting the needs of society and in meeting the needs of the individual.

Note: During the last decade, Dr. Thompson made educational study tours on higher education in Asia, Africa, Europe, North America, and South America.

PLANNING BOARD COMMENTS

"Universities must take advantage of learning resources beyond the campus; therefore, a variety of experiences must be provided in settings other than the classroom." Such utilization of different or new learning situations may not be expected to reduce the cost of higher education; it should increase costs. The Planning Board proposes to support a task force of representatives from the universities, various media, and employers of the products of higher education to investigate possibilities in this area and to suggest ways to support existing institutions in going forward in new avenues of service.

COMPREHENSIVE STATEWIDE PLANNING FOR ACCESSIBILITY WITH
EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY:
A DILEMMA FOR "1202" COMMISSIONS

by Dr. S. V. Martorana

To assure both a reasonable brevity and some greater clarity of presentation, this paper is organized into four parts. Books could be written on each of them and in actuality volumes discussing some of them already have been published. The four parts are: (1) a brief background commentary on the idea behind Section 1202 of the Higher Education Amendments of 1972 (P.L. 91-318); (2) a discussion of what is meant by "accessibility with effectiveness and efficiency"; (3) some observations about branch campuses, consortia, and regionalism in statewide planning and coordination of postsecondary education; and (4) a concluding comment on some needed "bridges" among postsecondary education interests and related recommendations as to how "accessibility with effectiveness and efficiency" in Mississippi might be effected.

Welcome to the "1202 Commission Club" - and Controversy

Few developments in postsecondary education have had the nationwide and rapid attention that came to the designation or creation of state commissions for comprehensive statewide planning of all postsecondary education as defined in Section 1202 of the Federal Higher Education Amendments of 1972. And few developments also have equalled this one in the controversy of positions taken as to the significance of its impact on the colleges of the country,¹ but despite this controversy, almost all of the states now have acted to formulate these commissions.² You in Mississippi share with those in the other states a common duty and a common dilemma; the duty is to provide leadership and action to improve upon and make better use of statewide planning to advance and expand postsecondary educational opportunities in the state with maximum and efficient use of all existing resources; the dilemma is how to achieve the objective of maximum opportunity in postsecondary education in absolute terms and yet do so with minimum use of scarce resources.

As seen from the federal level, the logic for the 1202 Commissions is relatively clear and straightforward. It included three elements: (1) a recognition that the trend among the several states toward creating state boards responsible for statewide planning and coordination (and in some cases, control and governance) of postsecondary education was already strongly in evidence;³ (2) these actions at the state level carried some serious flaws in that virtually none of them provided a platform and procedure which truly encompassed all postsecondary educational interests in a single planning format and process; and (3) the role of the federal government is to serve as an aid to the states in improving the organization and programs in education, not to take a controlling position over them. After much debate among members of Congress and a great deal of partisan plea put to them by many spokesmen for particular interests in postsecondary education, the lawmakers settled on the idea of special commissions "broadly and equitably representative of the general public and of public and private

Prepared for the Mississippi Postsecondary Education Planning Board, May 14, 1975
Jackson, Mississippi

non-profit and proprietary institutions of the state" to conduct comprehensive statewide planning at the state level as the most promising way to proceed with least likelihood of generating a situation of federal control.

Federal interference and control, therefore, has been avoided, but a new basic issue is emerging for each state as it moves toward implementing the law. The issue to be resolved is how the duties and functions of existing state agencies (boards, commissions, councils, etc.) now responsible for planning and coordinating sectors of postsecondary education (in whole or in part) under existing state laws can interrelate with the new and more comprehensive federally stimulated emphasis. Put as a question: Can postsecondary educational planning consistent with existing state laws and structure continue to operate smoothly alongside the new 1202 Commissions which draw their authority from a different channel - Section 1202 of the Federal Act and follow-up gubernatorial and/or legislative action at the state level? How is coordination between the two or more authorized agencies to be effected? If differences appear, how are they to be resolved? These are the formidable questions that will tax the ingenuity and imagination of state bodies over the next decade.

Accessibility with Effectiveness and Efficiency: What Does It Mean?

Clearly, the goal of comprehensive planning in the federal law and the related mandate to the 1202 Commissions is to extend more opportunity for more education to more people in all of the states. Part of the language in Section 1202 (a) about the purposes of these commissions and their planning activities is:

" . . . to enable it to expand the scope of the studies and planning . . . with respect to, all public and private postsecondary educational resources in the state, including planning necessary for such resources to be better coordinated, improved, expanded, or altered so that all persons within the state who desire, and who can benefit from, postsecondary education may have the opportunity to do so."

When can it be said by a state that this goal of accessibility to postsecondary educational programs has been effectively accomplished? The meaning of the concept (typically referred to as "open access") is changing rapidly from that generally held even as recently as 1948. And the potential impact of the change in the concept on your deliberations here in Mississippi are particularly important to the work and purposes of the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission.

When President Truman's Commission on Higher Education in 1948 called for "equal opportunity for all" in higher education,⁴ the idea was clearly to make it possible for all who had the talent, ability, and motivation to be admitted to college and complete two years of study after high school should be assured an opportunity to do so. Because this level of capability was deemed within the limits of almost all persons in the American society, this call for "universal opportunity" was expressed and in due course was given heed by all states in the land.

Today the concept of the necessary degree of access to postsecondary education considered to be adequate for and equitable to all is much more encompassing. Included are many

more groups in the population besides the recent high school graduates; and included is the idea of choice among types as well as availability of programs and institutions in postsecondary education.

Colleges and universities are called upon to provide more opportunity for women, for the elderly, for prisoners in correctional facilities, for persons in the military services, and many other groups of adults who have the potential but usually not the opportunity to pursue further educational interests. The needs of these individuals is quite different from those of the traditional full-time student, or even of the traditional student who may be attending part-time, for the traditional student is typically white, male, recent high school graduate. In order to serve the "new students" as K. Patricia Cross has documented well, it will be necessary that postsecondary educational institutions adopt new concepts of curriculum, instruction, counseling, and supportive services, as well as more democratic policies of admission.⁵

The idea that a true extension of postsecondary educational opportunity goes beyond the mere provision of a chance to go to college and should also provide the student a reasonably fair chance to seek and get entry into the college and program of his choice, is the basis on which many of the newer financial aids programs for students are founded. Most dramatic and well known of these are the Basic Educational Opportunity Grants and the Supplementary Educational Opportunity Grants provided by the federal government under provisions of the Higher Education Amendments of 1972. But actions at the state levels such as the new Tuition Assistance Program in New York State and a similar financial aid program recently adopted in Texas also have the objective of maintaining for the student a broader range of choices of college to attend - public, private, non-profit or proprietary; two or four-year; complex or single purpose; serving residential or commuting students; etc.

Under these circumstances and value constructs, then, it may well appear that the goal of extending the "accessibility" of postsecondary education is not effectively accomplished until all persons in a state have an equitable and realistic opportunity to go as far and as high in study after high school as their aspirations and abilities to succeed suggest. Indeed, this is made explicit in a recent statement by New York State Commissioner of Education, Ewald B. Nyquist:

"Open access" will have been achieved, in my judgement, when every adult citizen of this state has the opportunity to enter the postsecondary system in a program of study suited to his own needs and when he or she has the opportunity to continue through the baccalaureate, if he or she has both the capability and desire to do so."⁶

Knowing the commitment to advancing and extending postsecondary educational opportunity in Mississippi held by members of the state's Postsecondary Education Planning Commission, I am confident that the ideal expressed by Commissioner Nyquist represents also the goal you envision for Mississippi.

But in the practical world in which we live, a forward view to the effective attainment of that ideal cannot be cast in a manner insensitive to the great effort that the constituencies of postsecondary education make to support. This effort is a truly tremendous one and, as will be shown later in this paper, is becoming more demanding of both public and private resources each year. It is for these reasons and for a realistic recognition that the postsecondary educational enterprise like all others must be accountable to its constituency that the concept of efficiency needs to be added to that of effectiveness in judging the quality of plans projected for the enterprise. "1202" Commissions in every one of the states are seeking ways and means to provide maximum postsecondary educational services with minimum consumption of scarce fiscal, personal, and material resources. Comprehensive statewide planning, therefore, is coming to mean both an examination of external considerations of demand and an internal examination of the ways and means employed by postsecondary education to meet these demands.

New practices in postsecondary education are coming out of the efforts to find new ways to provide more postsecondary education for more people with minimum consumption of resources. No longer are colleges and universities operating as isolated islands of learning; neither are they any longer giving instruction and providing programs of research and public service in traditional styles or frameworks. As a consequence, colleges and universities express growing interest and activity in "non-traditional" learning and instruction, concepts of the "open university" or "university without walls," and the general concept of constructive change and how to manage it.⁷

One of the developments that comes out of these new departures in postsecondary education should be noted carefully by the Mississippi Postsecondary Education Planning Commission; it is the redefinition of ways that students may earn credit toward academic degrees and simultaneously a diminishing importance attached to classical notions of "residence credit." Faculties are giving greater attention and finding it possible to validate credit earned by students in a wide range of study methods and learning experiences. The fact that this is being done in increasing dimension throughout all types of higher educational institutions and programs and that the educational practices involved are gaining widespread approval of accrediting agencies and other interests concerned about maintenance of quality in academic pursuits are particularly germane to the discussion to follow in this paper.

Mississippi has not taken a back seat to other states in exploring for and instituting new ways to provide postsecondary educational services to the citizens of the state. In 1966 it completed an examination of the entire system of higher education and projected a design for improvement and expansion that was predicated on a greater diversification as well as heightened cooperation and coordination among all institutions of higher learning.⁸ The state now has one of the outstanding statewide systems of educational television and several other achievements about which it can be truly proud.

Branch Campuses, Consortia, and Regionalism in Statewide Planning and Coordination

One important way that Mississippi moved forward in statewide planning for postsecondary education avoided a pitfall encountered in several other states; it was to stress inter-institutional cooperation and to discourage individual institutions from developing full-

scale branch campuses in response to demands for a greater coverage of the geographic area of the state. Two recommendations from the 1966 report show this policy explicitly:

It is recommended that regional centers be established in which all off campus courses will be offered and which will provide appropriate resources and facilities and administrative supervision and services.⁹

It is recommended that no new resident university centers be contemplated or established until adequate experience has been gained with existing and proposed centers in Jackson and one on the Gulf Coast.¹⁰

By taking this policy line, Mississippi not only avoided the problems generated when two or more colleges or universities move to establish branch campuses in the same locality, but it also anticipated the more positive approaches which were to emerge to marshal the collective resources of several institutions to serve a common locality - consortia involving diverse institutions and regionalism in long-range planning. These approaches are generally viewed as much more promising than branch campuses of existing institutions to achieve the dual objectives of effectiveness and efficiency in the effort to make postsecondary education more accessible. This is true even though the basic reasons for these actions by postsecondary educational institutions have changed: during the decades of rapid expansion in the 50's and 60's the reasons were to accommodate the burgeoning enrollments; now with enrollments and levels of support both tending to level off, the reasons are to conserve resources.

The evidence is clear that generally speaking, new resources for postsecondary education in general, and for the collegiate sector, that is, for traditionally recognized colleges and universities as opposed to proprietary postsecondary educational institutions, in particular, are decreasing. The evidence supporting this conclusion is seen in the increasing practice of states and the federal government of providing funds to students directly to assist them toward further study and training rather than to increase levels of institutional support. As colleges and universities find it increasingly difficult to get new resources, the pressure and absolute necessity for wise use of old, that is, existing resources become simultaneously more obvious and more compelling to the future continuation of operations and maintenance of reasonable levels of quality.

Evidence of the decline in new resources available for postsecondary education is clearest in the decline in rates of increase from earlier years; while in most states the absolute dollars provided for higher education are still larger than in past years, the need to keep up with inflation in the general economy accounts for most of the absolute dollar increases in the last two or three years and, clearly, the "Golden Age" is past. Sharpest insight into the import of the decline in support provided for higher education is seen in measures that relate it to the total civic enterprise at federal and state levels. According to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, "The percentage of the GNP spent on higher education (not including capital construction and certain other accounts) doubled from 1960 to 1972 - from 1.1 to 2.2 percent, but it fell to 2.1 percent by 1975."¹¹ And colleges and universities are not doing well in competing with other governmental services of the states either. Glenny and Kidder report that, nationwide, total state appropriations for institutions of higher education as a percentage of total state general revenue rose from 11.24 in 1963 to 14.66 in 1971 but fell to 14.26 in 1973.¹²

If no (or fewer) new resources are to be expected for postsecondary education, one step that the institutions are considering more and more carefully is one to make the most of the resources at hand. The supporting constituencies expect this; if the colleges and universities react constructively to the expectation, some recapturing of the low public confidence now expressed in higher education can result. Beyond this public relations purpose, however, lies the stark fact that if the future prospect for higher education is a continuation of recent moves by public sources at all levels (federal, state, and local) as well as private constituencies to slow down provisions of new support for higher education, colleges and universities must find ways and means to make the resources they already have stretch further. At first this may create tensions and some new problems. In the long run, however, it may be found as enlightened action, for, as is now generally accepted in higher education throughout the country, some expansion is expected to occur into the early 80's but relatively little growth after that for the rest of this century. If colleges and universities can "get over the hump," so to speak, the long run challenge will be to maximize use of existing resources which will be more than necessary if earlier norms of determining need are retained. That time may well be the golden era for improvement of the quality of postsecondary education as the 50's and 60's were for expanding the quantity of opportunity for many other thousands of persons at this level of study.

Let us look at the existing resources that we are talking about. I shall make reference only to national data, but I am certain that as I do so, you will apply the logic of my observations to the specifics you know exist for Mississippi. Most obvious to the layman and typical state budget examiner's view is the investment the American people have put into the capital plant for higher education. According to a nationwide inventory conducted in the fall of 1973, the 3,019 higher education institutions possessed an estimated 1.8 billion gross square feet of buildings to accommodate 7.4 million FTE students. Of the total gross area reported, approximately two-thirds was in public and one-third in private institutions. Of special interest to a concern that all good existing resources be used if at all possible and to the discussion of regionalism to follow in this paper, is the further statistic that significantly higher proportion of the gross space reported by public institutions was less than satisfactory for use and needed renewal (25.3 percent) than was true for the private institutions (16.5 percent).¹³ Again, the questions most pertinent to the discussions in this paper are: Can all that space be put to good use in higher education: if so, how? If any is good and available but not used, waste may be evident; if such non-use exists when simultaneously alternative action toward new construction or renewal is undertaken at current inflated costs, waste becomes obvious! Logically and fairly, the same type of data can be cited and questions raised concerning the investments already made in the material that goes inside the buildings - library holdings, laboratory and shop equipment, and so on, but the point is clear, so need not be belabored.

The most essential as well as most costly resource available for higher education, however, must not be passed over; it is the faculty and supporting personnel to the instruction, research, and public service functions of higher education. Over a million professionals (faculty and other professional staff) and more than 600,000 full-time faculty are in the collegiate sector to secure the more than 10 million students enrolled. Again, roughly a third of these are in privately controlled institutions.¹⁴ According to the AAUP, 14.5 billion dollars of institutional revenues in 1971-72 flowed to faculty for compensation and another 11.5 billion flowed to other staff for compensation and to supplies.¹⁵

Once again we must ask, how can all this specialized talent be utilized for the betterment of society through higher education? Clearly some new ways to manage resource allocations seems in order. Consortia of institutions when more than one operate in a given locality and regionalism of all postsecondary educational resources according to a statewide plan are two approaches.

Just what is the relationship of consortia and inter-institutional cooperation to regionalism and regionalization and what is the status of development of these notions in higher education in this country? For the past year and a half, Gary McGuire, a research assistant, and I in the Center for the Study of Higher Education/Pennsylvania State University, have been probing this question. With the cooperation of the members of the Statewide Higher Education Executive Officers, the results of a nationwide study are now going to press and will be published by the Center for the Study of Higher Education/Pennsylvania State University. Time and space permits giving only some highlight findings here.

For purposes of our study we define regionalism as that view of a geographic sub-section of a state (or of several adjoining states) which considers all (or a number) of the postsecondary educational components collectively and seeks to establish a coordinated relationship of their goals, programs, and/or resources. That is the idea, the concept; regionalization is then simply the acts or processes by which the concept is put into practice; the implementation of regionalism is regionalization. It is manifested, obviously, in some form of interinstitutional, cooperative arrangement.

For purposes of our study, however, we attached another criterion for inclusion of inter-institutional arrangements into the counts of practice we wanted to describe; it was that the regional arrangement be one that was officially recognized by an authoritative agency in the state. This could be, naturally, the Governor or Legislature by executive action or statute, or a state-level coordinating or governing board responsible for postsecondary education in whole or in part in the state.

This matter of official recognition is important, for it is a way to separate the concept of regionalism as an aspect of statewide planning and coordination of postsecondary education from the more general phenomenon of consortia which are more typically ad hoc, voluntary, interinstitutional arrangements. These merit attention because (1) they are in some sense forerunners of regionalism, (2) because they are in some cases coming into the process of recognized, official regionalism, and (3) because they provide already some basis of experience from which officials considering regionalism can profit. Identification and preliminary examination of these consortia dates back now nearly 20 years,¹⁶ but in recent years, the person most directly following this development is Lewis D. Patterson, headquartered in the American Association of Higher Education. For several years he has produced an annual count of formally organized consortiums. The 1975 count is 106. But, as he says, this is only a small glimpse of the interinstitutional connections emerging throughout the land:

"Numbers at best only tell a part of the cooperative movement. In the past two years new areas are receiving increased attention such as among community colleges, in continuing education, in medical and health programs, in military programs, in theology and in the arts. Two trends to observe in the future will be: the movement to state regionalization where it becomes increasingly difficult to distinguish between voluntary and statutory systems; and a broadening of the base of participation to include a full range of the postsecondary community and related community/regional agencies in cooperative arrangements."

In passing, one should note for the record that the achievements of consortia to date are not very impressive. Franklin Patterson (no relation to Lew, I'm told) paints a dim view of their attainments as contrasted to their aspirations in a book-length treatment entitled Colleges in Consort: Institutional Cooperation Through Consortia.¹⁸

But McGuire and I discovered much stronger interest and action in regionalism and regionalization than we expected. Here only a few highlights from the study can be reported, for time and space are limited. The full report will be published by the Pennsylvania State University, Center for the Study of Higher Education.¹⁹

We discovered that regionalism and regionalization in the several states has progressed way beyond what we expected to find. Thirty-one states have embarked or are in advance stages of study of regionalizing postsecondary education in their states. And these 31 states have 47 different patterns of regionalization either in motion or under serious study and official consideration for adoption. Now there is a larger number of plans or patterns of regionalization than the number of states that were reporting because in some states there are two or more officially recognized plans. That may be surprising at the start, but on further examination it is not surprising. For example, in New York State the Board of Regents has a plan officially recognized for regionalization of postsecondary education in public, private, and proprietary postsecondary educational resources; since the Regents is an official body that plan obviously has an official status. Also in the state of New York, however, the State University of New York, which is the state umbrella organization for public higher education outside of New York City, has a regionalization plan which it is seeking to affect. This also has an official status because it is under the aegis of the Board of Trustees of the State University of New York. One should emphasize there is some attempt at coordination going on between those two officially endorsed plans which is, as yet, rather amorphous; in the interim the two plans for regionalization need to be recognized in any report that pretends to describe the status of the development of this new educational movement in the country at this time.

Seven states have moved into regionalization by virtue of an enabling statutory action. Now that is indicative, we think, of the seriousness by which this matter is being viewed in these states and it may be, again, an indication of things to come. In the other states it has come about as already indicated by administrative action of those agencies that have some authority of law behind them. More information about such topics as their staffing patterns, mechanisms for policy formation, and modes of financing are covered in the report. Most of the regional designs, as yet, do not have fully developed central coordinating or executive staffs. But a number of them do. All have some form or mechanism for arriving at policy and guiding operations, and all that survive, of course, must some way or another be financed. Together they suggest a portentous and fascinating possibility for a new era in American postsecondary education.

More Work on "Bridges" Between Postsecondary Educational Institutions: Some Concluding Observations and Recommendations

We come now, of course, to the primary question in which you, as the responsible persons for "comprehensive statewide planning for all postsecondary education" in Mississippi are interested. It is: If the observations that I have made thus far concerning postsecondary education in the nation generally and about Mississippi specifically are reasonably accurate,

what are the implications for the work of your Commission and for the future of postsecondary education in this state? Several conclusions and comments, it seems to me, can be presented that merit your consideration and that of the Governor, Legislature, and all of the citizens of the state.

The first is that much progress has been made in the last few years; indeed, when the relatively limited resources available for the task of postsecondary education against the achievements reached in serving the people of the state are noted, the record is a rather remarkable one. According to the measures of statewide education activity reported by the U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health Education, and Welfare, Mississippi citizens show high need for postsecondary educational opportunity and related programs and services, but the state ranks relatively low in provision of needed support. For example, Mississippi ranks 45th among the states in median school years completed by persons age 25 or older and 46th in percent of employed persons in professional, technical, and kindred occupations; and it ranks 42nd in support achievement in higher education relative to burden (appropriation per high school graduate). It is significant to notice however, that Mississippi is extending a much greater effort than most other states to do what it is now doing on behalf of support of college and university education; it ranks third among the states in tax effort for higher education.²⁰

Looking to recent achievements in Mississippi that relate more specifically to the observations made earlier in this paper, attention centers on several important facts: (1) there is now a considerable body of experience on which to draw concerning the operations of the Universities Center in Jackson; (2) an upper-level branch of the University of Southern Mississippi has established on the campus of Gulf Park College, a facility recently acquired by the Board of Trustees of State Institutions of Higher Learning; (3) substantial funds have been appropriated each year during the recent past to support off-campus branches and related cooperative programs among institutions; (4) legislative recognition has been provided to these new localized developments in higher education; and (5) the privately controlled and supported colleges continue to draw significant numbers of students and, thereby, to provide an important public service to the society and economy of the state.

Although admittedly not based on an in-depth study or analysis, a number of comments and suggestions seem logical and feasible. These observations, I emphasize, are based largely on the discussion already presented. Since 1966 I have had only cursory and intermittent opportunity to give attention to developments in postsecondary education in Mississippi and more recently have had only the chance to examine the new legislation on branches of universities and colleges (Chapter 332) and the related policy statement formulated by the Board of Trustees.

Granting, then, that much has been accomplished in Mississippi that deserves public acclaim and commendation, there yet remain a number of problems and weaknesses that call for special attention, if the comprehensive planning the Planning Board sets in motion is to achieve accessibility with effectiveness and efficiency in the state. One of these is a reexamination of the legal restrictions as to the ways in which the branches of universities can operate. In this reexamination particular attention is needed to the freeing of these operations from outmoded concepts of residence credit requirements for academic degrees and from arbitrary distinctions of the types of programs to be provided students during daytime and evening schedules. As pointed out earlier, colleges

and universities increasingly grant that residence credit can be earned in many different ways and that the time of day during which programs are offered is perhaps the least meaningful basis on which to determine the quality of an educational offering.

Another conclusion evident in the current status of postsecondary education in Mississippi is that the several sectors of interest and activity in postsecondary education remain relatively detached and maintain limited inter-sector communications despite their being in a common enterprise. Along with a reexamination of the law concerning branches of universities, a new effort seems called for to establish deeper and more continuous communication and cooperation between and among the several state universities, the junior colleges and the universities, and the publicly and privately controlled institutions. The Postsecondary Education Planning Board seems to be the admirable, indeed sole, agency to provide this leadership. In doing so, a new sector, heretofore totally neglected in planning efforts, namely, the proprietary postsecondary schools, institutes, and colleges, need to be included.

There are not state universities fully established in the major population centers of the state; yet there are in each of these areas complexes of institutions including branches of the major state universities. These facts suggest that the concepts of consortia and regionalism discussed earlier have a special potential for positive results in the effort to expand access and conserve limited resources. A key policy in this regard, however, needs specific formulation in the plans promulgated and careful implementation in later actions: it is that the specific roles to be played by each of the institutional participants in a consortium or regional inter-institutional design should be based on a careful analysis of the needs of the citizens, businesses, industries, governments, and professions in the locality concerned. Only when these needs for postsecondary educational programs and services are determined and compared carefully with the programs, purposes, and resources, that individual institutions can bring to bear on them is it possible to formulate valid divisions of the educational labor called for and to make equitable allocations of support to get it done.

These continuing tasks and suggestions, of course, are not new to you. Indeed, their persistent presence throughout more than a decade of attention to problems of long-range planning and coordination of postsecondary education in Mississippi with which I have had the good fortune to get acquainted may be a source of discouragement to you on the Postsecondary Education Planning Board. Rather than a pessimistic view of the future, however, I believe it more correct to view the outlook for the future of Mississippi as a really bright one. Progress that is real, continuing, and significant can be documented despite the continued presence and reality of some of the problems at hand. But most important, for the long-run future, in my view is the fact that for the first time in the history of the state there is in the minds, hearts, and spirits of the members of a single state agency an official responsibility for forward planning that can view postsecondary education comprehensively; that can bring all of the resources, talent, and energy of all of the interests to bear on all of the state's needs for this level of education; and that has a real capability as well as opportunity to get the job done. That agency, of course, is the Postsecondary Education Planning Board; the task is formidable indeed, but you stand the best chance yet presented in Mississippi to do it.

PLANNING BOARD COMMENTS

The Planning Board commends the Legislature for its actions in recognizing and supporting educational programs which make higher education accessible to many who do not have access to a main university or junior college campus. Financial support from the Legislature and provisions for utilizing total educational resources available will provide many educational opportunities of great benefit to all citizens.

The total postsecondary education resources of the state include the state universities, the junior colleges and vocational-technical branches, the private colleges, and the proprietary schools. All planning for future development of the educational establishment should involve all of these sectors, maintaining at the same time the independence of the several governing boards and agencies.

In order to facilitate planning and effective use of resources, the Board recommends revision of the present law establishing branches of universities so that the Board of Trustees of State Institutions of Higher Learning will have more freedom in promoting needed services from the branches.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

STUDENT AID

- American Council on Education. Federal-State Responsibility for Facilitating Student Access. Washington, D.C., 1975.
- American Council on Education. New Concepts of Student Access. Washington, D.C., 1975.
- Barke, Yoone B. Financial Aids for Postsecondary Education: An Update, from The Journal of Student Financial Aid. Vol. 5, No. 1, 1975.
- Boyd, Joseph D. A Federal/State/Institutional Partnership in Providing Opportunity Grants for Financially Needy Students, from The Journal of Student Financial Aid. Vol. 1, No. 2, 1971.
- California State Legislature. Report of the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education. 1973.
- Consortium of Financing Higher Education. Federal Student Assistance: A Review of Title IV of the Higher Education Act. 1975.
- Ferrin, Richard I. A Decade of Change in Free-Access Higher Education. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1971.
- Financing Equal Opportunity in Higher Education. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1969.
- Kristol, Irving. On the Democratic Idea in America. New York: Harper and Row, 1972.
- McCormick, Joe L. The Role of the Federal Government in Student Financial Aid - A History, from The Journal of Student Financial Aid. Vol. 2, No. 1, 1972.
- McFarlane, William H. State Support for Private Education. Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Regional Education Board, 1969.
- Marmaduke, Arthur S. Who Will Pay for College? from The Journal of Student Financial Aid. Vol. 1, No. 2, 1971.
- Mississippi Association of Private Colleges. Independent Higher Education in Mississippi. 1974.
- National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education. Financing Postsecondary Education in the United States. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1973.

National Task Force on Student Financial Aid Problems of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. National Draft Report on Student Financial Aid Problems. Washington, D.C., 1975.

New Approaches to Student Financial Aid. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1971.

Orwig, M.D. Your Financial Aid Applicants. Iowa City: ACT Research and Development Division, 1969.

Rauh, Morton A. Student Financial Aid at Private Colleges. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Great Lakes Colleges Association, 1972.

Sponsored Research of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975.

The Chronicle of Higher Education. A Century of Growth for U. S. Colleges. Page 9. August 19, 1974.

The Council on Higher Education for the State of Washington. "Follow-up Study of Tuition and Fee Comparisons and Federal Student Financial Aid Rankings." 1975.

Toward Equal Opportunity for Higher Education. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1973.

U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare/Office of Education. Financial Statistics of Institutions of Higher Education for Fiscal Year Ending 1973.

Who Pays? Who Benefits? New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1974.

THE OPEN UNIVERSITY

Bremer, Anne and Bremer, John. Open Education: A Beginning. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1972.

Bourne, Richard and McArthur, Brian. The Struggle for Education, 1870-1970 (London, England:) School Master Publishing Company, 1970.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Less Time More Options. Highstown, N. J.: McGraw-Hill, 1971. The Open-Door Colleges. Highstown, N. J.: McGraw-Hill, 1970. Toward A Learning Society. Highstown, N. J.: October, 1973.

Cross, K. P. "External Degree Symposium." Journal of Higher Education. 44: 70-71, March, 1974.

Digest of Report of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, McGraw-Hill, 1974.

Gibbs, O. B. and Lee, Herman C. "Colleges Without Walls: The Status of Non-Traditional Learning in California Community Colleges," College and University. 49: 267-74, Spring, 1974.

Luskin, Bernard J. Library: A Focal Point for the Extended University." Community and Junior College Journal. 44: 70-71, March, 1974.

Marland, R. B. "External Doctorate in Education, Blessing or Blasphemy?" Phi Delta Kappan, 55: 163-168, November, 1973.

Mitchell, Donald P. "Let's Set the Record Straight: A Case for Nova University's External Doctorate in Education." Phi Delta Kappan, 56: 370-375, February, 1974.

Niblett, W. Roy., and Butts, R. Freeman. Universities Facing the Future. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1972.

Nyquist, Ewald B., and Humes, Gene R. Open Education. New York: Bantam Books, 1972.

Nova University: National Ed.D. Program for Educational Leaders, Summer Institute, 1973 (July 26 - August 2, 1973)

Ritterbush, Phillip C. Let the Entire Community Become Our University. Washington, D. C.: Acropolis Books, Ltd., 1972.

Taylor, Harold. Students Without Teachers. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969.

COMPREHENSIVE STATEWIDE PLANNING FOR
ACCESSIBILITY WITH EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY

- 1 S. V. Martorana, State Level Planning for Community Colleges: 1202 Commissions, A Centripetal or Centrifugal Force in Postsecondary Education. Iowa City, Iowa: American College Testing Program, 1974.
- 2 Aims C. McGuinness, T. Harry McKinney, and Richard M. Millard, The Changing Map of Postsecondary Education, State Postsecondary Education Commission (1202): Their Origin Development, and Current Status. Report No. 66. Denver, Colo.: ECS, 1975.
- 3 Documented by such sources as: S. V. Martorana and Ernest V. Hollis, State Boards Responsible for Higher Education, Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1960; J. L. Zwingle and Mabel E. Rogers, State Boards Responsible for Higher Education, 1970. Washington, D. C.: GPO, 197; Lyman Glenny, Autonomy of Public Colleges, N.Y.: McGraw-Hill, 1959; and Robert O. Berdhal, Statewide Coordination of Higher Education, Washington, D. C.: American Council on Higher Education, 1971.

- 4 Higher Education for American Democracy, Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education. Vol. I. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1948.
- 5 K. Patricia Cross, Beyond the Open Door, San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass, 1971.
- 6 Ewald B. Nyquist, "A Time for Leadership and A Time for Opportunity," Statement before the Governor's Task Force on Higher Education. February 13, 1975. p.5
- 7 See for example: Samuel B. Gould and Patricia Cross, Explorations in Non-traditional Study. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972; and S. V. Mortorana and Eileen Kuhns, Managing Academic Change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.
- 8 S. V. Martorana and others. Strengthening Mississippi's Higher Education Through Diversification, Cooperation, and Coordination. (A Report of a Study of the Role and Scope of Higher Educational Institutions.) Jackson, MS: The Board of Trustees of State Institutions of Higher Learning, 1966.
- 9 Ibid. p. 138
- 10 Ibid. p. 136
- 11 Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. More Than Survival: Prospects for Higher Education in a Period of Uncertainty. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. 1975. p. 1
- 12 Lyman A. Glenny and James R. Kidder. State Tax Support of Higher Education: Revenue Appropriations Trends and Patterns, Berkley, Calif.: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, Univ. of Calif., 1973. p. 17
- 13 Higher Education Comprehensive Planning Program, Inventory of Physical Facilities in Institutions of Higher Education, Building Survey, Fall, 1973. Raleigh, North Carolina: Higher Education Facilities Services, Inc., June, 1974, pp. 2-3.
- 14 American Council on Education, A Fact Book on Higher Education, Institutions Faculty and Staff, Students, Third Issue, 1974. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1974. pp. 74-127, 74-129.
- 15 AAUP Bulletin, "Hard Times: Report on the Economic Status of the Profession," 60, 1, Summer, June, 1974. p. 189
- 16 S. V. Martorana, James Messersmith, and Lawrence Nelson, Cooperative Projects Among Colleges and Universities. Curicular No. 649, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1961.
- 17 Lewis D. Patterson, 1975 Consortium Director Washington, D.C.: AAHE, 1975, p.v.
- 18 Franklin Patterson, Colleges in Consort. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

- 19 S. V. Martorana and Gary McGuire, Regionalism and Statewide Coordination of Postsecondary Education (A preliminary report of a continuing study.) Univ. Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University, Center for the Study of Higher Education, (forthcoming).
- 20 D. Kent Halstead. Statewide Planning for Higher Education, Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1975. As cited in memorandum of January 23, 1975 from Dr. E. R. Jobe to members of Postsecondary Education Planning Board.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Jack L. Woodward is Dean of Men and Director of Financial Aid at Millsaps College, Jackson, Mississippi. Dean Woodward is a newly appointed member of the Postsecondary Education Financial Assistance Board of the State of Mississippi. He has served as President of the Mississippi Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators, as a member of the Executive Council of the Southern Association of Financial Aid Administrators, and as Chairman of the Southern Association of the College Entrance Examination Board. Among awards received are the Mississippi Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators Outstanding Service Award, 1974-75, and listed as Outstanding Educator of America, 1973.

Grant Dungee is Chairman of the Department of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation of Alcorn State University, Lorman, Mississippi. Dr. Dungee is a graduate of Kentucky State College and has also received the degree of MS., HS Director, and H.S.D. from Indiana University.

Dr. Dungee's outstanding success in developing winning track teams resulted in his being selected to coach U. S. women's track athletics for the last Olympic Games, and also to coach the U. S. women's track team in the 1975 international competition.

Paul G. Orr is Dean and Professor of Educational Administration and Higher Education of the University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Alabama. Dr. Orr is a graduate of North Texas State University and holds the Ph.D. degree from Michigan State University.

In addition to his experience as director of one of the nation's prestigious colleges of education, Dr. Orr has a rich background of accomplishment in administering, researching and policy making in education in Central and South America.

Cleopatra D. Thompson is Dean of the School of Education of Jackson State University, Jackson, Mississippi. Dr. Thompson is also a member of the Mississippi Postsecondary Education Planning Board. She is a leader in Mississippi educational civic and social affairs and serves on numerous boards and committees working in these areas. She is a world traveler, having visited on professional or other missions in Asia, Africa, Europe, North and South America. She holds a B.S. degree from Alcorn State University, the M.A. degree from Atlanta University, and the Ed.D. degree from Cornell. Additional post-graduate study was done at the University of Chicago and the State University of Iowa.

S. V. Mortorana is research associate at the Center for the Study of Higher Education and Professor of Higher Education in the College of Education of Pennsylvania State University. Dr. Mortorana has the M.A. and Ph.D. degrees in education from the University of Chicago. Prior to his appointment at Pennsylvania State, he served as vice-chancellor for community colleges and provost for vocational and technical education at the State University of New York. He is known in Mississippi as director of a role and scope study involving public and private sectors of postsecondary education in 1965.